

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the remarks and amendments provided herein.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13-19, 23, 24, and 26-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Application 2005/0173401 (US ‘401) in view of US Patent 6,809,301 (US ‘301) and US Patent 6,949,723 (US ‘723). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Neither US ‘401, US ‘301, nor US ‘723, alone or in combination, teach or suggest a central processor configured to control a plurality of heating means both independently and dependently of each other. As disclosed in the specification, the central processing unit operates the heating means independently of each other. “However, depending on the specified function input from the operator the operation of each heating means is also dependent on the present function of another heating means.” See page 9, lines 1-6 of the specification. US ‘401 discloses operation of a plurality of heating elements based upon a power consumption algorithm; US ‘301 discloses a microprocessor for cycling power to oven heating elements; and US ‘723 discloses a processor that controls electrical power signals delivered to a plurality of burners in a cooktop. There is nothing within any of these cited references that disclose, teach, or suggest a central processor that controls a plurality of heating elements both independently of each of the other heating elements and dependently of each of the other heating elements. For at least the reasons discussed herein, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 10, and 20-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US ‘401 in view of US ‘301 and US ‘723, as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13-19, 23, 24, and 26-32 above, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,198,080 (US ‘080). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. Claims 4, 10, and 20-22 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 16, which are believed to be allowable over US ‘401, US ‘301, and US ‘723 for at least the reasons discussed above. US ‘080 does not make up for these aforementioned deficiencies. Accordingly, the combination of US ‘401, GB ‘647, US ‘723, and US ‘080 does not render obvious claims 1, 8, or 16 or claims 4, 10, and 20-22, which depend therefrom.

Appl. No. 10/821,362  
Amdt. Dated June 11, 2007  
Reply to Office action of March 12, 2007

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35483US1.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

/Una L. Lauricia/  
Una L. Lauricia, Reg. No. 48,998

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700  
Date: June 12, 2007